NPIC/TSSG/DED-1270-68
10 July 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, R&D Branch II, DED/TSSG

SUBJECT : Trip Report - Corning Glass Works

1. On Monday, 24 June 1968, [redacted] and I attended a conference at the Electronic Research Laboratory of Corning Glass Works, 3800 Electronics Drive, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602. Corning personnel attending this meeting were: [redacted] The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the physiology of seeing in conjunction with Corning's effort to develop an Improved Rear Projection Viewer Screen. 25X1 25X1

2. Dr. Vincent presented a recommended bibliography together with a copy of selected portions of the Human Engineering Design Guide prepared for us by The Boeing Company. His discussion of this material was well received.

3. During this meeting, [redacted] noted that Corning was now of the opinion that the development of a rear projection screen would be influenced strongly by other portions of the rear projection viewer and, therefore, a system approach was warranted. In this respect, he suggested that Corning personnel be allowed to coordinate the development of the screen directly with the developer of our new rear projection viewer [redacted] I told him I would look into this possibility and, if approved, determine the ideal time to effect the coordination. 25X1 25X1

4. The next important point discussed was agreement on definitions used to describe the screen characteristics. This had been requested under the previous contract and oral approval had been tentatively given for use of the definitions used by Corning. I advised [redacted] that we would be glad to review an up-to-date set of definitions, to be submitted by Corning, and come to an agreement on those to be used. 25X1

5. As the result of experience gained under the previous contract [redacted] suggested that a review of the specifications for the screen would appear to be in order. For instance, the ± 15% brightness variation requirement did not appear to be realistic since it would result in a "flat" presentation. Also, this variation in brightness was not in agreement with that recommended in our Human Engineering Design Guide. [redacted] and I will take a look at the previous specifications and recommend changes, if required, through appropriate channels. 25X1 25X1 25X1

SECRET

SECRET

SUBJECT: Trip Report - Corning Glass Works

6. A question was raised relative to the possibility of screening (isolating) the operating area in which the rear projection viewer would be used. If this could be done, the specification for diffuse reflectance would be relaxed, effecting a trade-off in favor of some other more critical characteristic. [redacted] noted that this possibility was being investigated. 25X1

7. [redacted] spoke of the bio-medical capabilities of Corning and suggested that they be allowed to utilize their capacity in this field in pursuing the present contract. Both [redacted] and I noted that this aspect of our research was being conducted by another contractor and Corning's pursuit along this line would probably result in a duplication of effort. 25X1 25X1

8. In discussing work done under the previous contract, it was noted by [redacted] that certain equipment had been used to obtain the required measurements. He suggested that this equipment continue to be used. However, he pointed out that measuring equipment capabilities varied with the different makes and suggested that we agree on which types of test equipment should be used. I told him that I would check on this. 25X1

9. Finally, [redacted] requested that we furnish a list of objectives applicable to the entire rear projector viewer, i.e., a system set of objectives. I will discuss this with [redacted] 25X1 25X1

TSSG/DED/R&DBII

Distribution:
Original - Route and file
1 - NPIC/TSSG/DED chrono file
1 - NPIC/TSSG/DED/R&D-II chrono file

NPIC;TSSG/DED [redacted] (10 Jul 68) 25X1

SECRET